PRIVILEGE MOTION.

Re. Minister's Statement at a Press Conference on Policy Matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, I will read the two privilege motions that have been tabled. One is from Sri C. J. Muckannappa and it reads as follows:

"This Assembly is of opinion that the recent Press Statement by the Hon'ble Revenue Minister on a matter of policy is a breach of privilege since it was not placed before the Legislature though the Legislature was in session at the time."

The other one is from Shri M. C. Narasimhan. It reads as follows:

"I beg to move that breach of privilege has occurred by the statement said to have been issued by the Hon'ble Revenue Minister in the course of a Press Conference held on 5th March 1958, in view of the Assembly being in session and in view of the fact that the Press Statement referred to above issued by the Revenue Minister refers to aspects of policy changes of a very important nature, that the said statement introduces changes in the matter of 'conversion fine' etc., which is in the nature of a fee/tax, that the said statement also has referred to Rs. 5,000 being provided for in this year's budget (*vide* supplementary Estimates Pp. 15, Demand No. 38) and 'adequate amount' being provided 'in the next year's budget'."

A representation was made by the Hon'ble member Shri J. B. Mallaradhya. These two motions of breach of privilege are also on the same point. All of them will be taken up together. I would like to know the views of the Hon'ble Members in this respect. If Shri J. B. Mallaradhya has anything to add, he may make a statement.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Mr. Speaker, I esteem it a privilege to have been asked to re-state my case.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not re-state.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In the light of any new facts that occurred to me if necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not even that.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then is it the desire of the Hon'ble Speaker that I should speak something in addition to what I have stated yesterday? If so I shall bear it in mind.

The point is this. I raised this issue yesterday with a view to clarify a point of convention involved, whether a Minister who is an Hon'ble Member of this House has the privilege of making a policy statement outside the House when the Assembly is in session and without the members having had an opportunity of knowing what that statement was in the first instance. I am prompted primarily by a desire to see that no procedural irregularity would creep in so far as the deliberations and acts of members of this House are concerned. There is a further point. I am doing this in exercising a sense of social responsibility of a type expected of a member of the legislature in respect of a very important matter not of privilege, but one of a convention, irrespective of party affiliations. In questioning the act of Ministers, I am trying to take a very detached and independent view in a purely non-partisan manner. I am anxious to see that as far as possible we in this house safeguard public interest and that we eliminate the real or apparent abuse of authority vested in Ministers in such matters. Also, my desire is to see that there is no real encroachment directly or indirectly on the sovereignity or the powers of this House.

When I raised this issue I was not very clear in my mind as to the importance of the issue involved. I now see that it has raised a very fundamental question of privilege or rights of members of the legislature in a parliamentary system of democracy. Sir, it is very clear that amongst the most important functions of a legislature is the one relating to a critical examination and supervision of the administrative acts by our ministers through a system of Cabinet Government. In examining that I am

prompted to say that this was one of the cases where the Ministers have acted in an indiscreet or improper manner. It is this: We, in this House, are allowed the means of obtaining information from Government through questions, resolutions, policy statement by ministers and even by the Governor's Address. When all these means are allowed to us, I do not know why a departure should have been made by the minister in resorting to the convening of a Press Conference for making a policy statement. There was no need nor any occasion for this. I think what he has stated in the Press Conference was in the nature of a policy statement or decision. When the session is on, there was no necessity for the minister to resort to this practice. Further, in a system of parliamentary Government it is the legislature which is the final arbiter in the matter of taking decisions on government policies. I am not denying to the Cabinet the privilege of initiating policies at all but the final decision on these policies is definitely with the legislature and when this element of collective responsibility is on the ministers, they cannot without reference to the legislature, go and make such policy statements in the Press.

Then, Sir, as I stated earlier, I want the Government to approach this subject in a realistic manner in regard to the kind of relationship that should exist between the executive and the legislature. This relationship should be envisaged in no other manner than one of co-operative partnership. They should not consider the members of the Legislative Assembly even if they are in the opposition any the less important. They do their portion of the duty. We want to give every facility to the government for the proper and smooth functioning of democracy. But, when cases like this arise, it is impossible to co-operate with the Government or appreciate the manner in which they are conducting the administrative acts. The principal feature of parliamentary democracy, is that they are immediately and legally responsible to the legislature. It is unnecessary for me on this occasion to refer to the extent and true nature of direct responsibility because there is such a lot said in the Constitutional Law and various judicial commentaries made from time to time. But, it is sufficient for me to say on this occasion that the keynote of Parliamentary Democracy is ultimate relationship between and the inter dependence of the Executive and Legislature. The act of the Revenue Minister displays either a total disregard of such relationship between the Legislature and the Executive or an inadequate appreciation of the real issues involved. That is the only point that I wish to stress.

Further, I am one of those persons who believe in the spirit of fair criticism or interpretations on the administrative acts of Government. This is no one-way traffic between the Executive and the Legislature. We on this side, would like to make comments in a spirit of true understanding and to ensure the observance of formalities of procedure. The members in the Treasury benches must understand the implications of our criticism and respond in a spirit of helpfulness and propriety. If that kind of understanding does not exist between the political parties in a legislature, notably between the Ruling party and the Opposition, it is very difficult for the parliamentary system to function.

In regard to the defence that may be put up on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the Minister, that the statement was not a policy statement, and that it was merely on a few administrative details, I wish to observe, Sir, that the dividing line between a policy statement and the statement on general administration is very thin.

It is very difficult even for an experienced administrator to make a policy statement without explaining details of an administrative act. The Minister in this case has in voluntarily made a statement, in which he has made a declaration of the statement of policy. If he makes a statement of policy, he cannot make it without reference to details. I am afraid the Minister cannot seek shelter on the pretext that after all his statement was in the nature of an administrative act.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him not deal with the question in an elaborate manner. The Hon'ble Member can mention a few points.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Yes, Sir, I shall mention other points too.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere.)—Sir, he ought to go in detail and say what he feels about it. Suppose he gives only points. Would that be correct ? We should hear him in full so as to enable us to answer him.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To repeat is not in order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Not only are the Ministers individually and collectively responsible to the legislature for formulation of policies and giving concrete shape to them but they must also seek our approval to the ways in which and the manner in which they administer the State. This is all important. This particular instance has a special significance. Their administrative acts are subject to such directions, limitations and the conditions which the legislature may impose on them from time to time in regard to their functions and activities.

An incident like this happened in the Legislature at Madras sometime last year. I refer to the proceedings of the Madras Legislative Assembly of 16th July 1957. The subject matter of this incident was the abolition of the district boards. The Leader of the Opposition—I think it was Mr. John—raised the issue on the floor of the Legislature that the Minister made a statement to the Press in a Press Conference, before it came to the notice of the House. Regarding this matter, objection was taken on the floor of the Legislature. Mr. Subramanyam, on behalf of the Government as a spokesman, made the position very clear by saying that it was a mistake to consider it as a policy statement. Somehow or other the points for decision were formulated by Govenment and some enterprising pressman gave this as a decision of the Government. The Speaker ruled it out as a privilege motion, but made an important statement. He appreciated the assurance given by Mr. Subramanyam on behalf of the Government that all policy statements would be made only on the floor of the House and more especially when the Assembly was in session.

Sir, I made a lot of research and spent some time in the library of the Legislature Secretariat. But I am sorry I have not been able to get the necessary references relating to such instances in other Legislatures in India and beyond the Seas. It is such a difficult matter; my efforts have proved to be unsuccessful. I believe the Speaker will readily get authorities in support of the stand that I have taken.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They have been brought to my notice and they will be helpful to me.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—After all you are the final arbiter in giving decisions and ruling on points raised as the one now seized by the House.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—On a point of information. The Hon'ble Member said that the final authority is the Speaker. But the final authority is the House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Speaker represents the House and he is the symbol of the House. He is the only authority to give a Ruling and his decision is final. That is the view with which I said it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House is the supreme authority. There can be no doubt about it. As far as the rulings are concerned the Speaker's words are final.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—I very much wish the Hon'ble Member states what exactly is the statement of the Hon'ble Minister, without which I have not been able to follow him.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Here is a handout given to the Press. at the time of the Press conference. There are two statements made by the Hon'ble Minister—one with reference to the policy in regard to the future set up of gomal lands and the other in regard to the distribution of Amrit Mahal Kaval lands.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—How did the Hon'ble Member get at the statement ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—This is public property. All press handouts are readily available. I did not get at it by underhand methods. This is the statement which the Hon'ble Minister made. "The scheme (Improvement of Gomal lands) will be implemented this year only for which a provision of Rs. 5,000 is made. For the next year, an adequate amount has been provided for in the Budget, etc." That itself, I submit borders on privilege. It refers to next year's Budget, which is not yet placed before us. This is an important.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the exact nature of the statement ? It is not definite.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Rupees five thousand asked for is provided in the supplementary estimates of the current year. But the Minister has stated that a substantial provision is made in the Budget for the next year. Even that statement, I am afraid, unless the House is seized of it, I do not know if it is proper that such a statement could be made.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Can it ever be leakage of the Budget to say that a substantial amount will be provided ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a leakage of the Budget.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I wanted to ask whether it is appropriate, The propriety of the statement is what I am questioning. From the beginning I have guarded myself. I have not raised this as a privilege motion. The other thing is about the Amritmahal Kaval lands. He has stated that on the basis of 32,400 acres available, 7,550 blocks were going to be made. My objection to this is—we are very soon to discuss the Jatti Committee Report where questions of basic holdings, economic holdings and family holdings will rise. I want to know whether it is appropriate for the Minister to say that 32,00 and odd acres will be divided into 7,000 family blocks, when the contemplated policy of land distribution is a matter open to serious discussion. That is why I have made a reference to these two statements made at the Press Conference. The press handout also contains other references on which decisions are already taken. But these two particular statements on Gomal and Amrit Mahal Kaval land should not have been made by the Hon'ble Member in a light hearted manner.

Sir, I would like to refer to another case that figured prominently in the House of Commons, as far back as 1-12-1949. A statement was made by Sir Arthur Henderson to an air accident that happened to a K. L. M Aircraft at Prestwick on 20–10-48. The Minister for Civil Aviation made a statement in regard to the decision by the Court of Enquiry constituted for the purpose to go into the accident. Sir, Arthur Henderson interfered in the debate and said "I and the other Minister jointly regret that such a statement should have been made outside the floor of the House when the matter was not seized by the House."

In bringing forward this objection, I should not be misunderstood as saying that the Press is not such an important institution. I am fully aware that it is the fourth estate in a Democracy and that the Press in Mysore has contributed its mighty share in fostering cordial and friendly relationship between the Legislature and the Executive and that the Press in Mysore has always upheld the highest traditions of Democracy in dealing with the Legislature and its members.

I believe in the dictum that first things must come first. We should have been given the highest priority in listening to the policy statement. Even in the Lok Sabha, you are aware Sir, that the Prime Minister or the Minister in charge of a portfolio interferes in the middle of a debate and makes a policy statement. Some time is allotted for such statements to be made.

There was only one occasion when this wholesome convention was sought to be relaxed in the House of Commons when Mr. Churchill was the Prime Minister and that was during the war. Mr.

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Churchill used to make very important policy statements outside the floor of the House even when the Parliament was in session when the public were rather perturbed about the things happening in several theatres of war. That was an extraordinary occasion and a national emergency. It was felt by the Prime Minister of England that the whole business of the House would be interfered with, if day in and day out he had to make Policy Statement only in the Parliament. The view was appreciated and acquiesced by the members of the House of Commons.

Except, for that Sir, it is a very well established convention in democratic countries that Ministers are not allowed or even permitted to make statements like that. I am aware that there is no rule or Government order or any kind of procedure fixed by the Legislature but I am sure that it is a very well-established convention to the best of my knowledge.

Sir, I wish to ask the Hon'ble House a question. Supposing a thing like that had happened in a bureaucracy? It is impossible to visualise what uproar would have been raised by the elected representatives of the people. I have been associated with the Legislature even as a member of the Civil Service. I am not aware of a single occasion when a statement like this—a policy statement—was ever made by the then Government even in those days of bureaucracy. If a thing like that had been done, there would have been a hue and cry in the Legislature. All the 300 and odd Hon'ble Members would have raised a hue and cry. I am only saying this because in a democracy, we expect things to be very much better and the working of democracy is a continuous process of learning, trial and error and broadening of one's vision. Democracy is an ever growing and evolving institution.

Sir, the Hon'ble Minister's intention might have been very laudable. But if intentions alone have got to be relied upon, we may be misled. In the initial stages of our democracy, we are in a state of adjustments and we are experimenting to find out the extent of control over various administrative acts of the executive by the legislature. I have the highest respect for the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue and I am quite sure that he is always guided by very laudable motives. Perhaps in an act of indiscretion he has just made a statement. I only wish to bring this point to the notice of this House. We shall consider it dispassionately without approaching it in a partisan spirit or treating it as a party matter. Let us in Mysore set up democratic conventions, healthy precedents, and in all such matters let this House be an instrument for the setting up of very desirable and unexceptionable conventions in a young democracy like ours.

With these few words, I commend this particular matter for the most earnest consideration of this House.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಲೋಪ ಬರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ಸರಕಾರದ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವ ಒಂದು ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಇಡುವಾಗ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂಥ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ಅವರು ಹಾರಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥ ತಪ್ಪು ಕಲಸವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ನೋವು ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಥಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುವುದಾದರೆ, ಹಾಗು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ, ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಆರ್ಡಿನನ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ. ಆರ್ಡಿನನ್ಸನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂತಿಷ್ಟು ಜೀವಮಾನ ಎಂದರೆ ಕಾಲಾವಧಿ ಇದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಆರ್ಡಿನನ್ಸು ಸಹ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಆಗಿ ಬರಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಇಂಥ ಬೃಹತ್ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಸರಕಾರಗಳು ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಕರಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯು ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ, ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸರಕಾರದ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವ ಹೀಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಾಗಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು, ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶದ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಇಮ್ಮಡಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಲೋಪಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಹಿಂಜರಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ನಾವು ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು

*Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಅಹಂಭಾವನೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪಕ್ಷ ಇದೆ. ಭೂರಹಿತರಿಗೆ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಅಮೃತ ಮಹಲ್ ಕಾವಲನ್ನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿಗೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುವುದು, ಗೋಮಾಳ ಉತ್ತಮ ಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಮುಂತಾದ ಸರಕಾರದ ಉನ್ನತ ತತ್ವ, ಮೇಜರ್ ಪಾಲಿಸಿಯನ್ನು ಜನತೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವಾಗ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕಾರಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ನಿಕೃಷ್ಟ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿನ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಮನೆಗೆ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಹೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಈ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಬಹುಭಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸರಕಾರದ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಗೌರವವೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವರು ಏಕೆ ಹಿಂಜರಿದರೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮುದ್ದಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆಯ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನೂ ಸಹ May's Parliamentary Procedure ಪುಸ್ತಕವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ತೊರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸಭೆ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವಾಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. It will be the property of the House. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 14 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅನುಭವ ಮತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಐದು ತಿಂಗಳು ಅನುಭವ ಪಡೆದವರಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು? ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಮಂಕು ಕವಿದಿತ್ತು? ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಗೌರವ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಲೋಪ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಜತ್ತಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇದೆ. ಜತ್ತಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಯಾಕೆ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, that is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not relevant.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is after the reply in the Upper House that he called for a Press Conference.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—What I said was that the Government was not committed to Jatti Committee Report. Government has an open mind.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಒಂದು ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್‌ನಿಂದ ಅವರು ಜಾರಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತನ್ನ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವವನ್ನೇ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೋ ಎಂಬ ಭಯ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಎರಡೂ ಸಭೆಗಳ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನುದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಜಂಟಿ ಅಧಿವೆ ಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣಮಾಡಿ ಸರಕಾರ ಇಂಥಿಂಥ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. He (Governor) has enunciated the policies of the Government in his Address to the Legislature. ಇಂಥ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಒಂದು ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್‌ಷನ್, ಒಂದು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. How are you going to ask the future generations to follow you? What is it that you leave behind? ಎಂದು ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ, ಇಂಥ ಬೃಹತ್ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಒಂದು ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಡವೇ? ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ 60 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿಯ 147 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗೌರವ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನೀವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ?

2-30 P.M.

ಆ ದಾರಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರು ಈ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸೇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾದುದು; ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾದುದು. ಇದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಗೌರವವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ನಿಂತು, "ನಾನುಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಅವರು ತಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಸರಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನಸ್ಸೊಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಈರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಪಂತ್ರಿತನ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಹತ್ತಿರವೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅಂತು ಅವರೀಗ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಘಾತ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಗೌರವವೆನಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೇನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯಾವ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಇವೊತ್ತಿನಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ convention ಅನ್ನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಇತರ 14 ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ಅನುಕರಣಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಂಕ್ತಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, while seeking your permission to move the privilege motion .....

Mr. SPEAKER.— Your privilege motion is not at all moved. You can say that you have tabled it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I have tabled this motion for the following reasons. There are two aspects so far as this motion is concerned. Before going into them, I would like to endorse the sentiments expressed by the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya to the effect that this motion is not meant as a personal disrespect to the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister whose past experience as a Minister the House is very well aware. There are two aspects to this motion. One is the question of policy as to whether any Minister belonging to the Cabinet rank or belonging to the Council of Ministers can make a statement of policy which vitally concerns vast sections of the people and which touches certain aspects of the land reform at the moment being discussed. The other question is the constitutional propriety involved in making the satement because the statment not merely refers to the question of policy I referred to earlier but also to certain information contained in the Supplementary Estimates. So far as the question of policy is concerned, Sri Mallaradhya has already said and he has also referred to a particular case. The Minister's statement dated 4th March 1958 which was released to the press contains statements relating to conversion fine which they seek to impose, grant of land from the Armit Mahal Kaval, illicit cutting of trees, cashewnut cultivation, etc. So far as the first aspect is concerned it may be argued that it is already the subject matter of a policy because in respect of the conversion fine or non-agricultural assessment the statement was issued under the rule-making power under the Land Revenue Code. Secondly, it was issued in the Gazette dated 27-2-58, *i.e.*, at a time when the Assembly was in session. Then, it might be argued that it was only under the rule-making powers that it has been done and that it was contemplated much earlier. Even if that position is conceded, since it was issued on 21-2-58 when the Assembly was not in session, it might be argued that this policy declaration has not been made when the session was on. I would like to invite your attention to another matter and it is that the policy statement says that these rules are being extended to the Bombay Karnatak Area also. On 4th Mach 1958 it says that so far as the Bombay Karnatak area is concerned it is going to be implemented. Possibly it is a question of raising land assessment because, as I understand, so far as the Bombay Karnatak Area is concerned, it may be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 6 to 20 per acre. This particular measure seeks to increase the non-agricultural assessment to the tune of Rs. 150 to 200, *i.e.*, ranging from Rs. 80 to 150 so far as the Bombay Karnatak Area is concerned. It is not as if these were rules made on 21st February 1958; on the other hand, these rules are proposed to be extended, as the policy statement says, subsequently. I would like to know if this is not a matter of policy so far as the Bombay Karnatak Area is concerned. Was there any difficulty for the Government to bring this matter to the notice of the House? There was an occasion to do this at the time of the Governor's Addrees. In fact, the rules relating to the grant of land have been referred to in the Governor's Address. Why was this paticular matter not referred to in the Address? Though it was an important matter, the Government did not deem it so. You have constituted a committee known as the Mysore Finance Committee which has also made a recommendation in respect of it. In such a vital matter of policy when you are seeking possibly to increase the conversion fine or the non-agricultural assessement in the Bombay Karnatak Area, why was it that the Government chose not to take the House into its confidence and why did they rush to the press with a statement like this? I would have had no quarrel if this particular matter, namely, the rules being extended to the BombayKarnatak Area, was not at all mentioned. They could have said that it was done under the rule-making powers, event hough I can question even that on the ground that they knew the Assembly was going to be in session on 21st February or the date on which it was supposed to meet

and therefore there was no necessity for it and no need for hurry and this matter could have been brought before the House. Even if this argument fails, the other argument relating to the Bombay Karnatak Area cannot at all fail.

The second point, *i.e.*, so far as the Amrit Mahal Kaval is concerned, it has already been discussed in the previous session. I am not prepared to say that it is a serious matter of policy. The only thing I would submit with regard to this matter is that, since it is a question of distribution, the distribution machinery, the manner in which it is going to be distributed these things could have been allowed to be the subject matter of discussion before this House. That is only a matter of propriety.

Now the other one—this point has already been referred to by my friend—that hinges on the constitutional propriety involved in this matter; that is, in respect of the importance of Budget. The Press Note reads: "The scheme will be implemented this year only for which a provision of Rs. 5,000 has been made." If this particular figure of Rs. 5,000 had not occurred anywhere, if it had been simply stated that the scheme would be implemented this year perhaps it would have been very difficult to move a motion of privilege, but on the other hand since this particular figure has been mentioned, it is a matter for serious consideration and examination as to whether it does not attract the question of privilege because you would see that '5,000' appears on page 15 of Supplementary Estimates and it is Demand No. 38 and the exact figure is Rs. 5,000 in both places. So far as supplementary estimates are concerned, they are issued under art. 205 and whether it is a supplementary estimate or a budget, so far as the constitutional provision is concerned, arts. 202, 203 and 204 are made applicable. So far as supplementary estimates are concerned, they stand on the same footing as any other budget. You cannot make a distinction between a supplementary estimate and a budget so far as the constitutional propriety is concerned. It is too well known and I do not think it is necessary for me to stretch this point further to say that, so far as a budget is concerned, secrecy is of paramount importance and it is one of the most important privileges of this House; it is the only privilege that we have in the matter of budget; there is no other privilege. So leakage of budget is definitely a matter which attracts the question of privilege and in this particular instance, since I have brought it to your notice that a matter contained in the supplementary estimates was already the subject-matter of a publication in the press, that is, it was dated 4th March 1958 and so far as supplementary estimates are concerned, it was handed over to us on the 6th March by about 3 o'clock, in the later part of the afternoon; it was not available before that. So this House and Hon'ble Members of this House are made known of the implementation of the scheme and the provision of Rs. 5,000 therefor only two full days after it was made known to the press and released for publication. If there is any authority for the proposition that even in respect of supplementary estimates any particular item can be revealed to the press without consulting the House, it is really difficult to search an authority for the proposition. Though there may not be exact authority, we will have to derive a ruling from the principles laid down in respect of similar matters. It will be very clear from those authorities that so far as budget is concerned, secrecy is of paramount importance. You are well aware of the famous case of Dalton, a case where the Finance Minister made known to the press correspondent one or two taxation items at 3 o'clock just prior to making a speech on the floor of the House and the press correspondent immediately rushed to the press and before the Minister completed his statement on the floor of the Parliament, it was public property. It was only one or two items of taxation measures that were made known. It is not necessary that the entire budget figures should be made known; any particular item accurately made known should be sufficient to attract the question of privilege.

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

I would like to read a passage from the Journal of Society of Clerks at the Table of Parliaments on page 336. This was a case of disclosure to the press of extracts before their publication. The same principle is applicable in this case also. It was no doubt in that particular case the privilege motion was ruled out and it was held that it was not a case of privilege for certain other reasons. In that case, the Speaker said as follows: "The fact must remain that it was a wholly undesirable principle that before Hon'ble Members themselves had had a chance of reading what was in the report of the Select Committee something should have taken place which ought not to have happened." Whether my privilege motion is admitted or not, it is not the most important criterion. If my motion and Mr. Mallaradhya's motion do serve the same purpose and if it helps to establish a healthy convention, I am satisfied.

I have got one more point. Till the supplementary estimates are placed on the table of the House, it must be deemed to be a secret document. It is obvious it is not a public document.....

MR. SPEAKER.—You have already said so twice before; why do you want to repeat?

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—So far as the Third Schedule to the Constitution is concerned, the Minister is supposed to have taken an oath of secrecy. I would like you to consider as to whether it would not also amount to a breach, from this point.

MR. SPEAKER.—I would like the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement. After hearing him, Hon'ble Members will be able to formulate their views.

SRI M. P. PATIL.—After I make the statement, if the discussion is to go on, I shall have no opportunity to reply to the various points raised by the other members. It is better that I should be given a chance at the end.

MR. SPEAKER.—All right.

*SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere):—I heard with rapt attention the speeches made by my friend on the opposite side, but I am very sorry to state that I am not convinced of the stand taken by them. Whether the statement made by the Minister was a statement of policy or was an important statement or merely a statement—on these three points everything rests. It is not a statement of policy because after all, land revenue policy has not been stated here except that the lands should be distributed in this manner. The way in which they are to be distributed or the way in which certain conversion fine is to be recovered or the way in which gomal lands are to be cultivated or kept properly—if this is the policy, what is the principle then; what are the details? I am not convinced that these are policy statements. These are mere statements. If they are mere statements, the question is whether a Minister is prevented from making statements on matters of detail. It would be a different thing if it was an important statement Even there the point is whether a Minister would consider it as an important statement or a mere statement. That is a different thing altogether. So considering these aspects, the statement made by the Minister was only an ordinary statement, giving some details about the way in which certain things ought to be done. My friends who are trying to safeguard the privileges have all our support. In fact, we ought to safeguard the privileges of this House. What is the breach made in this respect, what was the convention established in this House-these are matters to be taken into consideration.

This is not a statement made on matters of policy but is merely a statement as regards the details of administration. If the entire time of the House should be occupied by merely making statements on unimportant matters and if those matters are discussed leaving the most important ones, that would rather be a breach of privilege than the one now referred to. Of course the Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan referred to one matter of secrecy, namely, about supplementary estimate, having been revealed. . . .

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. On a previous

occasion, when I tabled a privilege motion in connection with the appointment of Deputy Ministers, the Chair was pleased to give a ruling without hearing the other side. If the Chair felt that this is not an important matter to be discussed here since no policy is involved, I think it could have disallowed it. My friend Sri Bheemappa Naik made a statement that no important matter is involved.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No point of order can be so long. No point of order also is involved. It is simply an intervention in the debate to give his own opinion. The Hon'ble Member may resume his seat.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—We have heard them in rapt attention and let me also be heard. If the Chair still feels that there is a breach of privilege, it will decide. But have we not at least the right to say what we have got to say? What I said was that an important statement had not been made by the Hon'ble Minister and merely a statement giving some details interpreting the rules in the matter of administration of lands, grant of lands, etc. The Land Revenue Code empowers the Government to frame such rules as they deem fit. Those rules were framed and the Minister for Revenue merely interpreted those rules in the light of the future administrative work. That does not amount to a question of policy. I therefore submit that there is neither a breach of privilege nor the point raised is one which deserves the attention of the House. Of course the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya, a member of the Opposition, wanted to know whether such a statement could be made. This kind of preventing a Minister to make statements outside the floor of the House would really jeopardise the work of this House, and it would on the other hand facilitate if the statements made by the Ministers outside the House are discussed here and questions tabled on the basis of those statements.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—When the subject has already been discussed here he just now mentions that it does not deserve the attention of this House.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I am sorry I never meant anything. The Hon'ble Member raised a point here. If on the basis of that we prevent Ministers from making statements outside the House, it would interfere with the work of the House. By no stretch of imagination, can it be called a privilege motion. Under these circumstances, I submit that this is a matter which could be left there alone. The Hon'ble Minister at the same time may take note that this House is very jealous to guard its own rights. If he considers that an important statement has to be made, he may say it on the floor of the House, and make a statement. So far as policy statements are concerned, it is always the privilege of this House to enunciate the policy for the Ministers to initiate. Therefore they will have to be made by the Government on the floor of this House, and the House will have to approve of them. I only submit these matters for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister will speak.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I hope there will be no debate after my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I am entitled to support or to oppose.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So many members are entitled to support or oppose. I had given one hour for this. It is also over. There may be members who want to take part in the debate. I want to cut it down and call upon the Hon'ble Minister to reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ರಿಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಡಿ. ಮಾರಣ್ಣ (ಮೂಗಡಿ):—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎದ್ದು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ನೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಜ. ನೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದ ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. *(Sri B. K. Putturamiya rose)* ನಾನು ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I have been called upon to make a statement.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—You were pleased to call upon the Hon'ble Minister some time back and promised the House that you would give an opportunity to the House to express its opinion after the Minister made a statement. I want to know even now whether you would give time to the House for expressing its opinion after the Minister finishes the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will make it clear. When I called upon the other members to have their say, there were fifteen minutes. I thought I could accommodate one or two members. It was not possible. I could accommodate only one member during that time. As it is 3 o'clock it is better that the Hon'ble Minister makes his statement and I will give my ruling either today or some other day. If it is the intention of the members that they should take part I shall give time for it some other day. I am not continuing it today. Do the Hon'ble Members agree to it?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

3 P.M.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—I want to say something about constitutional aspects in regard to Hon'ble Member Sri M. C. Narasimhan's point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If we can take up this sometime later and transact other business of the House, I am willing to do so.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಈಗ್ಗೆ ಅರ್ಧಗಂಟೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಭಾನದ ಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾ ಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗತಾನೇ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸಭೆಯವರು ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾ ಡಬಾರದು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲು ಎದ್ದಾಗ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಿತ್ರರೊಬ್ಬರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತ ನಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾದಮೇಲೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು 'ನೀವು ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕು, ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ' ಎಂದು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು. ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಹಾಗೆ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಬಾರದು.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA—But this is a serious matter, Sir.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪ ಯೋಗಿಸಕೂಡದು. ತಾಳ್ಮೆಯಿಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ತಾಳ್ಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೆಟ್ಟದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ತಾವು ಯಾವ ಲಾಜಿಕ್‌ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗದು. ತಮ್ಮ ಲಾಜಿಕ್ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ apply ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನನಗೆ ಮಾತ ನಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿದೆ....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಬೇಕಾದಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತ ನಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಈಗ ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಈ ಎರಡು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಒಂದೇಸಲ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎರಡು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಬ್ಬರು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಕಾಲ ಚರ್ಚೆಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎರಡು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮೂರು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮುಗಿಯ ಬೇಕಾದುದರಿಂದ ಮೂರು ಗಂಟೆಯ ಸುಮಾರಿಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯವಿತ್ತು. ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಬಹಳಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವ ಕಾಶಕೊಡಲಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರೂ, ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ opinion revise ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಮೇರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವತರಹ inconsistency ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಮೇರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Sir, may I know who has to fix up the time, whether it is the Speaker or the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the Chair. The House will now adjourn for Tea and meet after half an hour.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.